

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 were pending and rejected. With this response the specification has been amended, claims 1-12 are unchanged and presented for reconsideration and allowance.

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5). The Office Action asserted that reference character 230 of FIG. 9 was not described in the specification and is further in violation of 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5). Applicants respectfully note that Page 23, lines 6-7 of the Specification states "FIG. 9 is somewhat similar to FIG. 1, and like components are numbered similarly." Respectfully, Applicants submit that the remainder of the description pertaining to elements of FIG. 9 highlight specific differences between FIG. 1 and FIG. 9. It is therefore believed that the specification contains a description of the reference character item 230 reflected within the illustration of FIG. 9.

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83(a). The Office Action asserted that the limitation "The flat surface provides a seal against contaminants" identifies new matter that was not previously shown and must therefore be cancelled from the claims. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion as the present application discusses this feature within the Detailed Description of FIG. 9 (see Page 24, lines 13-15) which states "The provision of a flat surface by element 217 proximate the component zone provides a convenient seal in system 210 against contaminants." It is therefore believed that the drawings are in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.83(a).

The Office Action indicated that the Specification was objected to because the cross reference information on Page 1 of the specification reflected a patent application serial number for recently issued U.S. Patent 6,762,847. Applicants have amended

Page 1 of the specification, as described above, to reflect this update.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-12 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Duquette et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,762,847) in view of Case et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,897,611). A Terminal Disclaimer obviating the double patenting rejection is submitted herewith under separate paper.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Christopher R. Christenson, Reg. No. 42,413
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CRC:RCB:sew